



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/995,042	11/27/2001	Robert H. Wright	36968/262349	9679
23552	7590	01/10/2005		
MERCHANT & GOULD PC P.O. BOX 2903 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903			EXAMINER VEILLARD, JACQUES	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2165	

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application N .

09/995,042

Applicant(s)

WRIGHT ET AL.

Examiner

Jacques Veillard

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the Applicant's communication filed on 6/25/2004.
2. Claims 1-47 are pending and presented for examination.
3. Claims 1, 8, 18, 25, 33, and 42 are the independent claims. Other claims are the dependent.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/25/2004 with respect to claims 1-47 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brandt et al.(U. S. Pat. No. 6,714,979) in view of Hartmann et al.(U. S. Pub. 2003/0055976).

As per claim 1, Brandt et al. disclose "A data warehouse infrastructure for web based reporting tool" by providing a common graphical user interface enabling the requesting, customizing, scheduling and viewing of various types of prices call detail (See Brandt et al. title, the abstract and col.1, lines 20-24). In particular, Brandt et al. disclose the claimed limitations of

Art Unit: 2165

“receiving customer data in a mainframe database system” by providing a data warehouse legacy system (See Brandt et al. Fig.3 component 80, and col.6, lines 54-60); “generating a report for each of a plurality of customer requests based on the customer data in the mainframe database system” (See Brandt et al.col.3, lines 49-59); “providing summaries of the reports” by providing a customer list (See Brandt et al. col.3, line 65 through col.4, line 12); importing selected data from the report summaries into a spreadsheet; and providing the spreadsheet to at least one terminal (See Brandt et al. col.4, lines 4-23, and col.29, lines 9-14).

It is noted, however, Brandt et al. did not specifically disclose a printer emulator. On the other hand, Hartmann et al. achieved this claimed feature by providing a system and method for servers display confirmation record response in a connection oriented client/server network connected with a printer emulator which allows the system to print reports (See Hartmann et al. page 1 section [0009], page 4 section [0040], and page 6 section [0045]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the art at the time of the Applicant's invention to modify the data warehousing infrastructure for web based reporting tool of Brandt et al. by incorporating a printer emulator mechanism taught by Hartmann et al. The motivation being to have enhanced the data warehousing system of Brandt et al. by allowing it to access the request display or printer device in order to print reports of customers quickly and efficiently.

As per claim 8, most of the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of claim 1. Applicant's attention is directed to the rejection of claim 1 above. In addition, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations

Art Unit: 2165

of “storing the reports on a storage device” (See Brandt et al. abstract, lines 5-10, and col.3, lines 45-48). Therefore, it is rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given for the rejected claim 1 above.

As per claims 2, 9 and 30, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein customer data comprises customer names, locations, and service request dates” (See Brandt et al. Fig. 10 and corresponding text, and col.20, lines 14-34).

As per claims 3, 10, 11 and 31, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein the selected data comprises report numbers and service request dates” (See Brandt et al. col.20, lines 14-34, and col.26, lines 50-52).

As per claim 4, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein customer data are received in the mainframe database system based on the plurality of customer requests” (See Brandt et al. Fig.3 component 80 as a legacy Mainframe system which comprises the backend business logical applications).

As per claim 5, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “further comprising selecting at least one report based on the selected data in the spreadsheet”(See Brandt et al. col.28, lines 56-62).

Art Unit: 2165

As per claim 6, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein a terminal operator selects the at least one report by viewing the spreadsheet”(See Brandt et al. Fig.3, component 50, col.7, lines 62-63, and col.28, lines 37-43).

As per claim 7, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “further comprising printing at least one report based on the selected data in the spreadsheet”(See Brandt et al.col.28, lines 44-55, and col.29, lines 9-11).

As per claims 12, 14 and 34, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “further comprising saving the printed reports as word processing documents”(See Brandt et al. col.27, lines 57-62, col.33, lines 10-11, and col.41, lines 47-50).

As per claim 13, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein each of the reports includes a unique report number associated with it” (See Brandt et al. col.10, lines 46-49).

As per claim 15, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein a file name for each saved report comprises the report number”(See Brandt et al. col.26, lines 50-52).

As per claim 16, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “further comprising connecting to the mainframe database system with a terminal emulator”(See Hartmann et al. page 4 section [0040]).

As per claims 17, 21 and 38, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein a single computer comprises the printer emulator and the terminal emulator” (See Hartmann et al. page 4 section [0040]).

As per claims 18 and 33, Brandt et al. disclose “A data warehouse infrastructure for web based reporting tool” by providing a common graphical user interface enabling the requesting, customizing, scheduling and viewing of various types of prices call detail (See Brandt et al. title, the abstract and col.1, lines 20-24). In particular, Brandt et al. disclose the claimed limitations of “receiving customer data, including service request dates, in a mainframe database system based on a plurality of customer requests” a data warehouse legacy system (See Brandt et al. Fig.3 component 80, and col.6, lines 54-60); “generating a report for each of the plurality of customer requests based on the customer data in the mainframe database system” (See Brandt et al. col.3, lines 49-59); “assigning a unique report number for each of the generated reports” (See Brandt et al. col.10, lines 46-49); “providing summaries of the generated reports as a customer list”(See Brandt et al. col.3, line 65 through col.4, line 12); “importing selected data from the provided report summaries into a spreadsheet”(See Brandt et al. col.28, line 43); “connecting to the mainframe database system with a terminal”(See Brandt et al. Fig.3 component 50 and corresponding text); “selecting reports based on the service request date for each of the generated

Art Unit: 2165

reports” (See Fig. 10, and col.20, lines 14-34); “providing the selected reports” (See Brandt et al. col.28, line 44, and col.29, line 11); “saving the provided reports as word processing documents” (See Brandt et al. col.27, lines 57-62, col.33, lines 10-11, and col.41, lines 47-50); and “storing the saved reports on a storage device” (See Brandt et al. abstract, lines 5-10, and col.3, lines 45-48).

It is noted, however, Brandt et al. did not specifically disclose a printer emulator. On the other hand, Hartmann et al. achieved this claimed feature by providing a system and method for servers display confirmation record response in a connection oriented client/server network connected with a printer emulator which allows the system to print reports (See Hartmann et al. page 1 section [0009], page 4 section [0040], and page 6 section [0045]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the art at the time of the Applicant’s invention to modify the data warehousing infrastructure for web based reporting tool of Brandt et al. by incorporating a printer emulator mechanism taught by Hartmann et al. The motivation being to have enhanced the data warehousing system of Brandt et al. by allowing it to access the request display or printer device in order to print reports of customers quickly and efficiently.

As per claims 25 and 42, most of the limitations of these claims have been noted in the rejection of claims 18 and 33. Applicant’s attention is directed to the rejection of claims 18 and 33 above. In addition, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “a file server in communication with the computer(See Brandt et al. abstract, lines 10-14). The Brandt system is integrated with a database server

Art Unit: 2165

corresponding to a file server. Therefore, they are rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given to the rejected claims 18 and 33 above.

: As per claims 19 and 36, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein a file name for each saved report comprises the report number”(See Brandt et al. col.26, lines 50-52).

As per claims 20 and 37, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein the storage device comprises a file server” (See Brandt et al. abstract, lines 10-13, and col.3, lines 42-48).

As per claims 22 and 39, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “further comprising deleting the customer data from the mainframe database system” (See Brandt et al.col.36, lines 20-22).

As per claims 23, 24, 40 and 41, the claims have substantially the same limitations as claims 22 and 39. These limitations have already been addressed in the rejection of claims 22 and 39. Therefore, they are rejected on similar grounds corresponding to the arguments given to the rejected claims 22 and 39 above.

As per claim 35, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “further comprising storing the saved reports on a storage device”(See Brandt et al. abstract, lines 5-10 and col.3, lines 45-48).

As per claims 26 and 43, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “further comprising a local area network in communication with the file server” (See Brandt et al. col.12, lines 1-12).

As per claims 27 and 44, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein the stored reports are accessible from the local area network”(See Brandt et al. col.9, lines 50-67).

As per claims 28 and 45, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein the computer further comprises a spreadsheet”(See Brandt et al. col.28, lines 56-62).

As per claims 29 and 46, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein selected data from the printed report summaries are imported into the spreadsheet” (See Brandt et al. col.28, 37-43).

As per claims 32 and 47, the combination of Brandt et al. and Hartmann et al., as modified, discloses the claimed limitations of “wherein the printed reports are stored on the file

Art Unit: 2165

server as word processing documents”(See Brandt et al. col.27, lines 57-62, col.33, lines 10-11, and col.41, lines 47-50).

Other Prior Art Made of Record

- | | | |
|----|------------------|-------------------------------|
| 7. | Khayat et al. | U. S. Pat. No. 6,327,571, |
| | Glaser et al. | U. S. Pat. No. 5,875,242, |
| | Fleischer et al. | U. S. Pat. No. 5,799,073, and |
| | Roper | U. S. Pat. No. 6,270,351. |

Conclusion


8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jacques Veillard whose telephone number is (571) 272-4086. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. to Fri. from 9 Am to 4:30 PM, alt. Fri. off..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272- 4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2165

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

J.V.

Jacques Veillard
Patent Examiner TC 2100

January 3, 2004